



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,100	07/10/2003	Yutaka Banba	35848	1988
116	7590	09/28/2007	EXAMINER	
PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 9TH STREET SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			RIZK, SAMIR WADIE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2112		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mn

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/617,100	BANBA, YUTAKA
	Examiner Sam Rizk	Art Unit 2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 July 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- Response to the applicant's amendment dated 6/28/2007
- Claims 1-13 have been Cancelled
- Claims 14-16 have been submitted for examination
- Claims 14-16 have been rejected

Drawings Objections

1. In view of the applicant amended drawings filed on 7/23/2007, all objections to the drawings are withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/28/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. The examiner disagrees with the applicant contention on page 3, lines 20-23 that:

"However, at no time does Murata teach or suggest "halting the process of the application of a scale factor *during* ADPCM decoding per sub-band in the presence of an unrecoverable transmission error in said audio compressed frame data," as required by claim 14. "

The Examiner point the applicant to several sections where Murata (US Patent no. 5925146) teaches halting (inhibiting, stopping, inactivating) the decoding process operation (that comprising the application of scale factor as disclosed in the flow chart of FIG. 10 and Fig. 9 in Murata) for example:

- Abstract, lines 5-6
- FIG. 2, reference character (3)

Art Unit: 2112

- FIG. 6, reference character (3)
- FIG. 17
- FIG. 22
- FIG. 25
- FIG. 29
- FIG. 33
- Col. 6, lines 25-26
- Col. 6, lines 50-51
- Col. 9, lines 7-9
- Col. 23, lines 8-10

The take away point is that Murata teaches in many ways (embodiments) of halting the decoding process operation in the presence of unrecoverable transmission error as disclosed in claim 14 of the instant application.

4. The Examiner disagrees with the applicant and maintains the rejection of claims (14-16). All the amendments and arguments have been considered. It is the Examiner's conclusion that claims (14-16) is not patentably distinct or non-obvious over the prior art of record in view of the reference, Murata. Therefore the rejection is maintained.
5. Copied below is the non-final office action mailed on 2/28/2007 in its entirety.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1,148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
6. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawahara et al. US patent no. 6434718 (Hereinafter Kawahara) and further in view of Murata.
7. In regard to claim 14, Kawahara teaches;
- (Currently amended): A decoding method for a signal having been encoded under use of a channel coding per transmission frame (314) having a plurality of compressed frame data (310,311,312,313), including:
 - a) bits of said plurality of compressed frame data (310, 311,312,313) grouped into a plurality of classes (320, 321,322) according to the degree degradation in decoding quality in the presence of transmission errors; (Note: Figures 2A, 2B and 2C and col. 3, line 28 and col. 4, lines (65-67) through col. 5, lines (1-5) in Kawahara)
 - b) each of the plurality of classes (320,321,322) having been subjected to different channel coding processes under use of different error protection codes, the decoding method comprising the steps of: performing different decoding for transmission frames in each of

the plurality of classes (320,321,322) grouped in descending order of error protection,

(Note: Figure 3 in Kawahara)

- ungrouping the plurality of compressed frame data (310,311,312, 313) from the plurality of classes (320,321,322), and

(Note: Figure 3, reference character (105)in Kawahara)

However Kawahara does not teach:

- in each of the plurality of compressed frame data [[(314)]] that is compressed by way of a sub-band ADPCM mode, halting the process of the application of a scale factor during ADPCM decoding per sub-band in the presence of an unrecoverable transmission error in said audio compressed frame data.

Murata, in an analogous art, that teaches reception data expander having noise reduced in generation of reception data discloses:

- in each of the plurality of compressed frame data that is compressed by way of a sub-band ADPCM mode, halting the process of the application of a scale factor during ADPCM decoding per sub-band in the presence of an unrecoverable transmission error in said audio compressed frame data.

(Note Figure 6 "PROCES OD ADPCM DECODER" and col. 11, lines (6-67) through col. 12, lines (1-18) in Murata)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Murata that perform halting the process of the application of a scale factor during ADPCM decoding per sub-band in the presence of an unrecoverable transmission error in said audio compressed frame data.

This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the need to for low power consumption without increasing the decoder complexity and that can suppress noise in reception of data.

8. In regard to claim 15, Kawahara teaches;

(Currently amended): Use of the decoding method of claim 14 on a coded signal wherein the bits of said compressed frame data are grouped into at least three classes (320, 321,322) involving first class (320), second class (321) of which the degree of degradation of the decoding quality is smaller than that of the first class and third class (322) of which the degree of degradation of the decoding quality is smaller than that of the second class (321), and wherein first process "convolution coding and addition of CRC check codes is performed for

bits classified as the first class (320), second process "convolution coding only" is performed for bits classified as the second class (321), and third process "no coding" is performed for bits classified as the third class (322).

(Note: col. 4, lines (35-39) and col. 4, lines (30-34) and col. 4, lines (42-46) in Kawahara)

9. Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as per claim 14.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Rizk whose telephone number is (571) 272-8191. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques can be reached on (571) 272-6962. The fax

Art Unit: 2112

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronics Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

Sam Rizk,

Examiner

ART UNIT 2112

9/21/07
JACQUES LOUIS JACQUES

JACQUES LOUIS JACQUES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100